



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wichtig für das Document, lesen wir aber *et—er—*, so ist sie nur eine ziemlich überflüssige Wiederholung und durfte daher in dem deutschen Texte unbeschadet des Sinnes ausbleiben.

Es fragt sich nun, sollen wir es wagen, an dem altehrwürdigen Texte eine Aenderung vorzunehmen? Dieselbe ist nicht gar gewaltsam. Wie sehr sich *r* und *t* häufig ähneln, weiss jeder Romanist (cf. auch Suchier, Jahrbuch f. rom. u. eng. Lit. XIII). Ein Irrthum konnte daher leicht jedem Abschreiber passieren, besonders einem Deutschen, der den frz. Text nicht mehr ganz verstand (cf. Koschwitz, l. c. 5). Diese Momente genügen allein schon, um die kleine Aenderung berechtigt erscheinen zu lassen. Dazu mag noch der Umstand kommen, dass mit *et in adiudha* eine Reihe im MS. zu Ende war, der Schreiber daher die ganze Phrase wahrscheinlich nicht in einem Zuge schrieb, sondern zwischen ein auf seine Vorlage sah, so den Zusammenhang völlig verlor und sich vielleicht auch durch das ähnliche *et in—er in* — täuschen liess.—Obwohl also, wie wir oben sahen, auch der überlieferte Text sich ganz wohl übersetzen lässt, so möchte ich mich doch für Bonamy's Conjectur entscheiden.

GUSTAV KARSTEN.

University of Geneva, Switzerland.

### ANGLO-SAXONICA.

#### þ

In the usual editions of our Anglo-Saxon works the MS. sign þ is printed in full *þæt*; in so-called critical editions, the expansion is at least indicated by italics, *þæt*. I am now satisfied that the only proper course, in *all* editions, is to retain the MS. sign, for the reason that it is not always = *þæt*.

When Wülker's *Beowulf nach der Handschrift* first came under my attention, it seemed to me that his sign þ must stand in some places for another word than *þæt*. But I was diverted from the investigation by more urgent matters. About two years ago, however, my eyes were opened very forcibly by the following passage in Leechd. III, 198. The title of the MS. runs in Latin: *De Somniorum diuersitate secundum ordinem abcdarii danielis prophetæ*, in English: *danielis þ witegan*. As if to make assur-

ance doubly sure, Cockayne has set in the margin: "So MS."

It was after this that I read the foot-note by Zupitza to his *Beowulf-facsimile and transliteration*, p. 2 (note to line 14 of the transcript): "*þ* generally means *þæt*, but sometimes, it would seem, *þa*; cf. Aelfric's Grammar 38, 3; 121, 4; 291, 2." Why did not Zupitza add a similar note to p. 37, line 4 (*Beow.* 766), to the effect that the MS. *sið þ se hearm-scaþa* might be read *sið þone se*, etc.? cf. Sievers Beitr. IX, 138. The passage is corrupt (that is, the MS. is not clear throughout); possibly we may have to adopt still another reading: *siððan*. But in any case *sið þæt* cannot stand.

See also p. 47, line 3 (*Beow.* 990), where Sievers proposes to read *þe*; Beitr. IX, 139.

I can add several more examples from my own reading. See *librum* = þ *bóc*, Luke iv, 20, Lind., where Rushw. has *ðio boc*.

See also *ð oper dei* Chron. (Earle) 1135 E. p. 260, 2; \* *þ rihte weie* Chron. 656 E. p. 31, 12; *eall þ lented tid* 1127 E. 256, 37; *þ mynstre* 963 E. 123, 28 (*mynster* is masculine, feminine and neuter in later English, but in any case we can not look for a neut. acc. "*þæt mynstre*"). Granted that þ may be an approximation to our modern "the," in the above passages, it is all the more remote from "that."

Kluge, in his edition of *Byrhtferth's Handboc*, *Anglia* VIII, 298—337, expands regularly *þæt*. Are we to read thus p. 309, 33: *fram þære easterlican tide þ heo eft cume*? Is not þ = *þe* "until?" See also 317, 10. 12; and perhaps also 322, 35; 323, 1 (after the verb *anbīdian*).

Morris, in his *Blickl. Homilies*, expands regularly *þæt*. This has led him into two blunders, one of translation, one of gender. Page 189, 2 the ejaculation *freme nu forþon þ þu ongunne*, where we are dealing merely with the familiar phrase *forþon þe* = "because" and the speaker says: "Go on, since thou hast begun," Morris translates "Accomplish what thou didst begin." What becomes of the *forþon*, in this rendering?

Still more unfortunate is *þa welan and þæt mycele gylþ* 53, 21. On the strength of this single passage and the assumption þ = *þæt*, Morris enters *gylþ* in his glossary as masculine or neuter. The word is unmistakably mascu-

\* My line-numbering for the Chronicle is by year and page.

line throughout. See all the other passages in the Blick. H.; also Bosworth-Toller; Pastoral 463, 30; 463, 34; 209, 18; 57, 18; 85, 7; Oros. 214, 1. We need not hesitate to look upon *þ* here as = *pe* and treat it as we would *Dipa* (sc. *Dido*) *pe wifmon*, Oros. 252, 17.

It is clear, then, that if *þ* may stand for *pa*, *pæs*, *pone* (or *pam*, *pan*), *pio*, and *pe*, the sooner our editors cease to tamper with it the better.

#### GOD- WRACU.

Sievers's collection of adjectives in -u, §303, is confessedly very meagre. May I venture to add one, on the strength of *pone godwraçan peof*, Blick. Hom. 75, 26?

#### CEAST, CEST.

Bosworth-Toller gives the word = "strife," but is uncertain as to its gender. The forms lites = *ceasta*, E. Stud. IX, 36. b 17, and *togeanes pære ceaste*, Aelf. SS. 182, 212 fix it as feminine. Hitherto no one—to my knowledge—has thrown any light on its etymology. Is it not borrowed from the Latin *quæstio* through the Celtic cest? M'Alpine's Gaelic Dictionary gives *ceisd* = question, doubt, anxiety.

#### GE-LAERE = LEER, EMPTY.

Acc. S. M. *gelærne*, E. Stud. VIII, 474, 52 Kluge, p. 472, pronounces this word ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. Undoubtedly it is very rare. But cf.: *ponne se geohsa of pære idlan wambe cymð 7 of pære gelæran, ne bet pone se fnora*, "when the hicket cometh of the foul womb and of the 'leer or empty one, the sneezing doth not amend it." Leechd. II, 62, 1; and *of to micelre lærnesse* = emptiness, Leechd. II, 60, 20.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

#### TWO WORDS OF DUTCH ORIGIN.

FLY, a "marsh," occurs in no American dictionary. Stormonth prints: "VLEI OR FLY *flā* [Dutch *vlei* a marsh], in *S. Africa*, a marsh; a swamp," etc. In the wooded region to the north of the Mohawk river, in the state of New York, embracing parts of Fulton, Herkimer, and Oneida Counties, the word [pronounced *flai*] is now specifically applied to a sphagnum swamp, or a beaver meadow, in which sense it has often been heard by the writer. An en-

gineer of the new Forestry Commission, to whom I applied, states that he has had occasion, too, to use the word in its local meaning.

The word, spelled *vlye*, or *vly*, [Dutch *vallei* = French *vallée*; English *valley*], meaning a marsh, or a marshy meadow, frequently occurs in Colonial documents, describing the patents and land grants. In old New York, *Smits Vly* (afterward Queen Street, now a part of Pearl Street), according to early accounts low and marshy, gave its name to the historical Fly Market which stood at the intersection of Maiden Lane and Pearl Street.

BEER CREEK. Several tap-rooms, or, more properly, "saloons," in New York bear the somewhat peculiar title of "Beer Creek" [in the local pronunciation, *krik*]. The name is, of course, suggestive of a flowing abundance. Why, however, "Creek" a word in this locality of infrequent application, rather than 'brook', or even 'river'? The name is, apparently, a folk-etymology that goes back to a Dutch prototype. *Bierkroeg* [Bier + Kroeg: German, *Krug*, Swedish, *Krog*, Danish, *Kro*; all in the same signification, an ale-house] is a common appellation for an ale-house in Holland and, manifestly, may have been, during the Dutch possession, thus applied here.

It is by no means an isolated case of the change of a Dutch form through the influence of mistaken analogy. Arthur Kill, for instance, was *Aghter Kil* (as it is given on the old maps), the back channel; *Boomptjes Hoek*, tree point, became Bombay Hook; *Kreupelbosch*, thicket, is now Cripplebush, and there are many others which will be cited in a subsequent article.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

Columbia College.

#### NOTES ON THE FINNSAGA.

##### I.

In his book entitled "Das Altenglische Volksepos in der ursprünglichen strophischen Form," p. 46 ff. Möller has successfully removed many of the difficulties which had hitherto opposed the interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon fragment known as "The Fight of Finnsburg" and of the corresponding episode in Beowulf. The correctness of his conclusion, that the combat described in the fragment is